

Calendar No. 30, the nomination of Adewale O. Adeyemo, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, be withdrawn and, notwithstanding rule XXII, on Thursday, March 25, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; further, that no further motions be in order, that any related statements be printed in the RECORD, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to come to the floor to bring up four subjects. The first one is 30 seconds.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, we hear from Democrats that they want to do things in a bipartisan way. Last year, Senator WYDEN and I developed a bipartisan bill that would save the taxpayers \$95 billion and reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

Everybody wants that. President Trump wanted it, President Biden wanted it, and there is no reason why in 1 week we couldn't get that bill passed. We don't have to wait until several weeks down the road to do something like that.

It didn't come up last Congress because both Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL were against it. It is bipartisan. We ought to move on that.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 949 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on another subject, I want to speak again about the border crisis created by the Biden administration. I spoke on this subject just last week, and the situation has not improved since then.

Encounters with family units and unaccompanied alien children continue to increase. There are now new reports that at some segments of the border, illegal immigrants are being released into the interior of the United States without receiving a notice to appear in immigration court. To be clear, it appears that the administration is now releasing some illegal immigrants into the United States without even attempting to give them immigration court dates, much less taking any real steps to ensure that they actually schedule their hearings and show up for their court dates in the future.

Once again, this is totally unacceptable. This is catch-and-release without even pretending to care whether the immigrants show up for court or are removed from the country in the fu-

ture. This is also not sustainable. Every sovereign nation has a right as well as a duty to its citizens to control its borders. What we are seeing from this administration isn't border control or security. You see it on television. It is chaos. It is what happens when you broadcast to the world that you have no intention of enforcing our Nation's immigration laws.

The President could take action to end this crisis today if he actually wanted to. He could restore the Migrant Protection Protocols and the asylum cooperative agreements that the Trump administration signed with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

He could start building more physical infrastructure along our southern border as administrations of both parties have done for over 20 years, including the administration in which Biden served as Vice President. Fencing isn't something new, and it has not been a partisan issue until just here lately.

Rather than propose unserious blanket amnesty legislation that contains no real border security, the President could work with Congress on common-sense changes to our immigration laws that we all know are needed.

Finally, the President could make clear that he is in favor of fully enforcing our immigration laws as written, across the board, remembering that he takes an oath that has the words to "faithfully execute" the laws.

Unfortunately, this administration believes that the surge in illegal immigration at the southern border, due to its policies, is a process to be managed rather than a crisis to be stopped. As long as that is the case, we won't be able to truly secure our border and cut off the flow of illegal immigration to this country. Let's hope things change soon.

ELECTION OF MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS

Madam President, on one other very short matter, I want to speak about something that is going on in the House of Representatives that I think we all ought to abhor. Congress should not overturn a legal, State-certified election.

I defended President Trump's right to litigate claims of election irregularities in our independent court system and defer to the judgment of independent judges. I was initially criticized for that position by partisans on the left who wanted me to make some sort of independent determination of election claims before the courts had ruled. I maintained my deference to the independent judges once the courts had ruled and Trump partisans did not like the rulings. So what happened? It led to criticism of me from the right then.

When objections were raised to counting certain States' electoral votes based upon State-certified elections, I voted against overturning those elections.

My position remains the same with respect to the purpose of my remarks today, and that is the State-certified

election of Representative MILLER-MEEKS, who now ably represents Iowa's Second Congressional District.

MILLER-MEEKS' opponent chose to forgo her right under Iowa law to present any claims of election irregularities to an independent panel of judges. Guess what. That is because, under Iowa law, she had no legal claim. Representative MILLER-MEEKS won fair and square as certified by Iowa's bipartisan election board.

The House Administration Committee is moving forward with a process to overturn this certified election, stating it will "exercise its discretion to depart from Iowa law." That is a quote I just gave from information given by the House Administration Committee.

They are proposing that the House of Representatives exercise its discretion to depart from Iowa law. They were elected under Iowa law. Every one of the 435 Congressmen were elected under the laws of their State. Isn't it a little bit outrageous that people would say we should ignore the law of Iowa in this case?

I hope that we can get every one of Iowa's four Congressmen and -women to vote to keep MILLER-MEEKS in office, and I want to hear from every one of my colleagues who decried overturning State-certified elections in January if each still holds that position.

Of course, attention to the Press Gallery—I was asked more times than I can count if I accepted the results of the Presidential election. It would be very timely and a very relevant question to ask Senators in the hallways if they accept the certified election of Representative MILLER-MEEKS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am glad to hear the distinguished Senator, my colleague and friend, speak about the problems on the southern border.

I feel for President Biden because he inherited a horrible mess from his predecessor, a man who said that he would build a wall, which he didn't—a wall that would stop illegal immigration, which it didn't—and that he would build it, saying he would get the money from Mexico, knowing that he would not get 1 cent from Mexico, but he repeated that falsehood hundreds of times around this country. He also actually took money away from housing for families on our military bases, from families living in substandard housing. It was money that Congress had voted for to repair the housing to make it safe, to remove lead, mold, and so on. He took that money to build a wall that he claimed, as I said, Mexico would pay for.

When I was the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we passed by about a 2-to-1 margin, after months and months and months of debate and work, an immigration bill here in the

Senate. Republicans and Democrats voted for it, and it certainly could have solved all of these problems.

When it went over to the House of Representatives, there were enough votes to pass it there, but it would not be with a majority of the Republicans. The Republican Speaker said that he could not bring up the bill, even though it had passed, because it was violating a rule very sacred to them, a rule named after Dennis Hastert, a former Speaker, and they could not violate the great respect they had for Dennis Hastert and his rule. So, even though it had passed, they did not bring it up. Of course, subsequent to that, Dennis Hastert went to prison for child abuse.

REMEMBERING JUDGE PETER W. HALL

Madam President, now on an entirely different matter, I want to speak about a dear friend, U.S. Second Circuit Court Judge Peter Hall, who died on March 11.

Ever since then, I have thought back to a conversation I had with him—just like many, many conversations I had with Judge Hall over the years—just a few days before he died. He was telling me about the health concerns he had, very serious ones, but that he was going to try one other thing that weekend that he had hoped may give him a longer spell of life, but it didn't. It was only a matter of days after that last conversation. As I said, it was one of many I had with him. A few days after that last conversation, he died. He died on March 11, just 1 week after announcing his decision to take senior status.

Chief judge of the Second Circuit, Debra Ann Livingston, gave a remarkable tribute in which she acknowledged his death.

In speaking for the court, Chief Judge Livingston said:

Judge Hall was our beloved colleague, and this is a grievous loss for our Court and for all of our judges. Over the course of nearly 17 years on the Court of Appeals, Judge Hall distinguished himself as a thoughtful and humane jurist. He was generous with his colleagues and ever considerate in matters both big and small. Judge Hall was committed to public service and taught us all by his example. He was a kind and very dear friend. This is a sad day for the judges of the Court of Appeals.

A deeper read of the two-page announcement offered more insights that help us understand what made Judge Hall the exceptional jurist that he was. Noting that Judge Hall left a "lasting mark" on a generation of law clerks, Chief Judge Livingston shared an anecdote as was told by one of those clerks. She said:

One winter morning we were working away in chambers, and he had not turned up. Not unusual, but we were all wondering if something had happened. He rolled in midday with his dirty work pants and torn flannel shirt—in other words, no more haggard than usual. He explained that he had taken his truck through the woods that morning after taking care of the horses but had gotten stuck. Luckily, he had an axe, so it was only a matter of chopping down a few trees to put under the truck tires for traction. He freed

himself and made his way into chambers like it was nothing—just another day on the Second Circuit.

Chief Judge Livingston repeated that story, told by one of Judge Hall's clerks.

But, you know, the story speaks to the person Judge Hall was: never too important to carry out the chores of the day; never too far from the Vermont woods that he loved so much.

I don't know how many times I would talk with him, and we might talk a little bit about the law or things like that, and then we would quickly go to tales of other Vermonters we knew, the things they had done, the places that we liked especially in our State.

And I thought, as more tributes have flooded in, the most common remembrances, of Judge Hall include words such as "decent," "gentle," and "caring."

His long career, which spanned years in both private practice and as a Federal prosecutor before joining the bench, demonstrated his commitment to the rule of law. It was a commitment that he showed early on when he served as president of the Legal Aid Clinic, while still earning his juris doctorate at Cornell Law School.

When I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2003, I was proud to recommend Peter Hall for the circuit court vacancy left by the passing of another dear friend, Judge Fred I. Parker. And it was no surprise to me that his nomination was met with very little resistance, either from the White House or from Republicans and Democrats alike on the Judiciary Committee.

I teased him sometimes about the fact that he was born in Hartford, CT, but moved to Vermont at the age of 11. Did that make him a real Vermonter? And the reaction I got from him was: Patrick, my great-great-grandfather served as Governor of Vermont in the mid-1850s. I had to admit, the judge had me there.

He always considered Vermont his home, and we are grateful that he did. Marcelle and I enjoyed our friendship, and we send our sincere condolences to his wife Maria Dunton and his five children and his five grandchildren.

I would also note, in concluding, that Judge Hall's former law clerks released a touching tribute, and I ask consent—and I will ask consent in a moment that it be printed in the RECORD, along with a list of their names, over 60 law clerks.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, their statement and their names be included in the RECORD.

Vermont and the legal community and the Federal bench have lost a great champion of justice.

As Chief Judge Livingston concluded in her statement, "Peter Hall lived a life of fidelity to principles, kindness to individuals, and service to the human community. He will be greatly missed." This is a great truth.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT HONORING JUDGE PETER W. HALL, BY HIS FORMER LAW CLERKS

On March 11, 2021, Vermont, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and our nation lost one of our best. Today, we honor Second Circuit Judge Peter W. Hall and write in honor of his memory.

Since his appointment in 2004, Judge Hall served on three-judge panels in over 750 cases and authored more than 150 opinions in published decisions. We consider ourselves extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity to assist him in that great work and to benefit from his example, mentorship, and friendship. To us, Judge Hall defines integrity and public service. His commitment to protecting and upholding the U.S. Constitution cannot be overstated.

Judge Hall was exactly what everyone should want in a jurist. If your faith in the American legal system had waned, Judge Hall could restore it. Litigants arguing before him have told us that from the bench, Judge Hall was fair-minded, engaged, perceptive, and honest. And that is exactly how he was in chambers too. Far from the cynical suggestion that federal judges are merely instruments of their appointing presidents, Judge Hall embodied the judicial oath, approaching every case individually and without any political predisposition. All that mattered was achieving the just and legally correct result in every case, no matter how high profile (or low profile) the litigants or issue.

Judge Hall kept his home chambers in the United States Post Office and Court House in downtown Rutland, Vermont. Judge Hall affectionately referred to Rutland as "the Center of the Universe," and so it was for the years we were with him there. Clerking for him was not only an education in the law, but in life outside of the urban centers where many of us went to law school. Who knew there were so many nuances to the colors of fall foliage or that there was a "mud season" between winter and spring? Traveling down to New York City with him to hear cases once a month was a study in contrast. Judge Hall demonstrated how to flourish in both worlds; he was as comfortable in downtown Rutland as he was in the marble courtrooms of the Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse at Foley Square. Judge Hall could seamlessly go from tending to his horses on a Saturday to representing the Federal Judge's Association at the International Association of Judges on a Tuesday.

Judge Hall possessed a rare and dedicated humility. You will not find indulgent, flowery, or self-aggrandizing prose in his opinions. Instead, you will find clear explanations of what the law is and how it applied to the litigants before him, written to be as understandable as possible to anyone reading the opinion later. Of the more than 100 majority opinions and countless summary orders Judge Hall authored in his time on the Second Circuit, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed only two (partially). We think that is a pretty good record, but you would never have heard Judge Hall tell you so.

We are particularly grateful to Judge Hall for his willingness to look outside the traditional boxes for his law clerks. We are a unique crew, at least as law clerks to judges on the Circuit Courts of Appeals go. Many of us were non-traditional law students. Others graduated from law schools outside of the elite institutions whose students can expect to go on to Second Circuit clerkships.

Others still took non-linear career paths to a clerkship, working in the law before coming to chambers. Some of us were all three.